

REMARKS

Claim 15 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by PCI Express™ to PCI/PCI-X Bridge Specification. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Claims 1-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the admitted prior art in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,594,712 issued to Pettey, et al., (“Pettey”). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Independent Claim 1 recites a first circuit coupled to a second circuit via a PCI data bus, “wherein the PCI data bus is configured to transmit data between only the first and second circuits.” In rejecting independent Claim 1, the Non-Final Office Action dated July 18, 2006, asserted that the admitted prior art does not teach the PCI data bus which is configured to transmit data between only the first and second circuits. The Final Office Action states that a review of the 35 U.S.C. §103 rejection set forth in the Non-Final Office Action dated July 18, 2006, does not reveal that “the Office Action asserts the admitted prior art does not teach a PCI data bus which is configured to transmit data between only the first and second circuits.” *See* Final Office Action, page 8. Applicants disagree. Both the Non-Final and Final Office Actions assert:

The admitted prior art does not disclose a second circuit coupled to the first circuit via the PCI data bus, wherein the second circuit is configured to receive the PCI formatted data from the first circuit via the PCI data bus, wherein the second circuit is configured to translate the PCI formatted data received from the first circuit into PCI-express formatted data; wherein the PCI data bus is configured to transmit data between only the first and second circuits.

See Non-Final Office Action dated July 18, 2006, page 3, and Final Office Action dated January 22, 2007, page 3-4. Applicants are at a loss for the Final Office Action assertion that the 35 U.S.C. §103 rejection does not reveal that “the Office Action asserts the

admitted prior art does not teach the PCI data bus which is configured to transmit the data between only the first and second circuits.”

The Final Office Action then asserts that Pettey discloses this missing limitation. *See* Final Office Action, page 8. Applicants can find no basis for this assertion in the 35 U.S.C. §103 rejection of the Non-Final Office Action dated July 18, 2006 or in the Final Office Action dated January 2, 2007. The Final Office Action on page 8 states that what is missing from the acknowledged prior art is the use of an interface adapter for adapting a PCI device to a PCI-express environment. However, Claim 1 does not expressly recite the use of an interface adapter for adapting a PCI device to a PCI-express environment. Rather, Claim 1 recites a PCI data bus which is configured to transmit data between only the first and second circuits.

A *prima facie* case of obviousness can be established when the prior art reference or references when combined, teach or suggest all the claim limitations. The Final Office Action seems to be ignoring Claim 1’s limitation of a PCI data bus which is configured to transmit data only between the first and second circuits. While Pettey may disclose the use of an interface adapter to interface a PCI device into an infiniband environment, and while this may be very similar to the PCI-express architecture, Pettey does not teach or fairly suggest a PCI data bus (or any other bus) between structure 206 of Figure 2 (equated with Claim 1’s first circuit) and structure 202 of Figure 2 (equated with Claim 1’s second circuit), which transmits data only between structures 202 and 206. As such, Applicants reassert their argument that Pettey in combination with the admitted prior art does not teach or fairly suggest all the limitations of independent Claim 1, and therefore

the Final Office Action has failed to establish a *prima facie* basis for rejecting independent Claim 1.

Independent Claims 11 and 15 also recite the limitation of a PCI data bus configured to transmit data between only the first and second circuits. In light of the foregoing arguments made with respect to Claim 1, Applicants assert that independent Claims 6 and 15 are likewise patentably distinguishable over the cited sections of the admitted prior art and Pettey.

It is noted that in their response to Non-Final Office Action filed November 18, 2006, Applicants added new claims 16-18. However, these newly added claims were not addressed in the Final Office Action. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to provide a specific basis for rejecting these claims, if one exists.

CONCLUSION

In view of the amendments and remarks set forth herein, the application and the claims therein are believed to be in condition for allowance without any further examination and a notice to that effect is solicited. Nonetheless, should any issues remain that might be subject to resolution through a telephonic interview, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at 512-439-5093.

Respectfully submitted,



Eric A. Stephenson
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 38,321
Telephone: (512) 439-5093
Facsimile: (512) 439-5099